arXiv:1007.3007v1 [math.AP] 18 Jul 2010

EXISTENCE AND NONEXISTENCE OF ENTIRE SOLUTIONS FOR NON-COOPERATIVE CUBIC ELLIPTIC SYSTEMS

HUGO TAVARES, SUSANNA TERRACINI, GIANMARIA VERZINI AND TOBIAS WETH

Abstract. In this paper we deal with the cubic Schrödinger system

$$-\Delta u_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} u_j^2 u_i, \qquad u_1, \dots, u_n \geq 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \quad (N \leq 3),$$

where $\beta = (\beta_{i,j})_{ij}$ is a symmetric matrix with real coefficients and $\beta_{ii} \geq 0$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. We analyse the existence and nonexistence of nontrivial solutions in connection with the properties of the matrix β, and provide a complete characterization in dimensions $N = 1, 2$. Extensions to more general power-type nonlinearities are given.

1. Introduction and main results

The purpose of the present paper is to analyze existence and nonexistence of nontrivial solutions of the cubic elliptic system

$$-\Delta u_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} u_j^2 u_i, \qquad u_1, \dots, u_n \geq 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \tag{1.1}$$

when $N \leq 3$. Here $(\beta_{ij})_{ij}$ is a symmetric $n \times n$-matrix with real coefficients and nonnegative diagonal elements, i.e. $\beta_{ii} \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. We say that $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$ is a *nontrivial solution* of (1.1) if $u_i \not\equiv 0$ for at least one $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, which then implies that $u_i > 0$ on $\mathbb{R}^N$ by the maximum principle. In order to motivate our results on (1.1), let us first consider the single elliptic equation

$$-\Delta u = u^{p-1}, \quad u > 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{1.2}$$

It is well known that (1.2) admits solutions if and only if $N \geq 3$ and $p \geq 2^* = 2N/(N-2)$. The nonexistence in the complementary cases has been proved by Gidas and Spruck in [10]. In this paper we will show that for $n \geq 2$ the existence or nonexistence of solutions of (1.1) depends in a subtle way on the coefficients β_{ij}.

In the case where $\beta_{ij} \geq 0$ for all i, j and $\beta_{ii} > 0$ for all i, the elliptic system behaves to a certain extent similarly as the single equation (1.2) for $p = 3$. In this case the system does not admit nontrivial solutions in dimensions $N \leq 3$ (where the cubic nonlinearity is subcritical). This follows from a more general nonexistence result of Reichel and Zou [18] relying on the method of moving spheres. It is the purpose of the present paper to study the non-cooperative case where the off-diagonal coefficients β_{ij} may be negative and therefore methods based on the maximum principle, like the method of moving spheres, do not apply. More precisely, we will analyze how $B = (\beta_{ij})_{ij}$ must differ from a matrix satisfying $\beta_{ij} \geq 0$ for all i, j in order to allow nontrivial solutions of (1.1). In the special case where $N \leq 2$ (unidimensional or planar problem) or $n = 2$ (two-component problem) we will answer this question completely by giving a necessary and sufficient matrix condition for the solvability of (1.1), see Corollaries 1.1 and 1.2 below. By this we complement and extend a recent nonexistence result, which has been obtained for the two-component problem in [4]. Nonexistence results in the whole space – also called Liouville type theorems – for the equation (1.2) and the system (1.1) play a crucial role in deriving a priori bounds for a larger class of boundary value problems via the rescaling method of Gidas and Spruck. In fact, in [9] Gidas and Spruck have used their nonexistence result for (1.2) to deduce a priori bounds for solutions of equations of the type

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u = f(x,u),\ u > 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \quad u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.3}$$

Here $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a smooth domain, and it is assumed that $\frac{f(x,t)}{t^{p-1}} \to h(x)$ uniformly in x as $t \to \infty$ for some subcritical exponent p, where $h \in \mathcal{C}(\overline{\Omega})$. In the same spirit, Dancer, Wei and Weth [4] have obtained some a priori bounds for the class of systems (1.1) in the two components case

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u + \lambda_1 u = \beta_{11} u^3 + \beta_{12} u v^2 & \text{in } \Omega \qquad u, v \geq 0 \qquad \text{in } \Omega \\ -\Delta v + \lambda_2 v = \beta_{22} v^3 + \beta_{12} u^2 v & \text{in } \Omega \qquad u, v = 0 \qquad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \end{cases} \tag{1.4}$$

Another class of Liouville type results for cubic systems has been proved, under some global growth condition, in [17], allowing to obtain uniform Hölder estimates for the solutions of system (1.4), and of the more general version

$$-\Delta u_i + \lambda_i u_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} u_j^2 u_i \quad \text{in } \Omega \qquad u_1 = \cdots = u_n = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \tag{1.5}$$

These nonlinear Schrödinger systems have received extensive attention in recent years, since they appear in mathematical models for different phenomena in physics such as nonlinear optics and Bose–Einstein condensation, see e.g. [1,3,7,19] and the references therein. In particular, for $\lambda_i > 0$, the question of which conditions on $(\beta_{ij})_{ij}$ assure the existence of positive solutions has been widely studied, see e.g. [1, 2, 13, 15, 19, 21, 22]. For $\lambda_i < 0$, existence and multiplicity of solutions in some particular cases were obtained also in [16]. We remark that, in order to derive a priori bounds for (1.5) via the rescaling method of Gidas and Spruck, a nonexistence result is needed both for the problem (1.1) and for nonnegative nontrivial solutions of the half space problem

$$-\Delta u_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} u_j^2 \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N_+ \ \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n, \qquad u_1 = \cdots = u_n = 0 \ \text{ on } \partial\mathbb{R}^N_+, \tag{1.6}$$

where $\mathbb{R}^N_+ = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : x_N > 0\}$. There is strong evidence that the nonexistence of nontrivial solutions of (1.1) – for a certain matrix B – also gives rise to nonexistence

of nontrivial nonnegative solutions of (1.6). In the two component case $n = 2$, this was already observed in [4], but the argument in that paper does not extend to the case $n \geq 3$. Since problem (1.6) requires very different techniques, it will be treated in future work, see [5].
To state our results, we first need to recall some notions for symmetric matrices. So let $S(n)$ denote the space of symmetric $n \times n$-matrices with real coefficients, and let $C_+^n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ denote the closed cone of all $c \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with nonnegative components c_i. A matrix $B = (\beta_{ij})_{ij} \in S(n)$ is called

- *positive semidefinite (resp. positive definite)* if

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n \beta_{ij} c_i c_j \geq 0 \text{ for all } c \in \mathbb{R}^n \qquad \Big(\text{resp. } \sum_{i,j=1}^n \beta_{ij} c_i c_j > 0 \text{ for all } c \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}\Big);$$

- *copositive (resp. strictly copositive)* if

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^n \beta_{ij} c_i c_j \geq 0 \text{ for all } c \in C_+^n \qquad \Big(\text{resp. } \sum_{i,j=1}^n \beta_{ij} c_i c_j > 0 \text{ for all } c \in C_+^n \setminus \{0\}\Big);$$

We note that copositivity is a weaker condition than positive semidefiniteness. In case $n \leq 4$ every copositive matrix can be written as a sum of a positive semidefinite matrix and a matrix having only nonnegative components, but this is not true for $n \geq 5$, see [6]. Copositive matrices play a significant role in quadratic programming (see [11]), while – up to our knowledge – they have not been discussed in the context of elliptic systems yet. In case $n \leq 4$, strictly copositivity can be characterized explicitly by inequalities between the matrix coefficients, see e.g. [12]. In particular,

- $B \in S(2)$ is strictly copositive if and only if

$$\beta_{11}, \beta_{22} > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \beta_{12} > -\sqrt{\beta_{11}\beta_{22}}. \tag{1.7}$$

- $B \in S(3)$ is strictly copositive if and only if

$$\begin{cases} \beta_{11}, \beta_{22}, \beta_{33} > 0, \\ \beta_{12} + \sqrt{\beta_{11}\beta_{22}} > 0,\ \beta_{13} + \sqrt{\beta_{11}\beta_{33}} > 0,\ \beta_{23} + \sqrt{\beta_{22}\beta_{33}} > 0 \qquad \text{and} \\ \sqrt{\beta_{11}\beta_{22}\beta_{33}} + \beta_{12}\sqrt{\beta_{33}} + \beta_{13}\sqrt{\beta_{22}} + \beta_{23}\sqrt{\beta_{11}} + \\ \quad + \sqrt{2(\beta_{12} + \sqrt{\beta_{11}\beta_{22}})(\beta_{13} + \sqrt{\beta_{11}\beta_{33}})(\beta_{23} + \sqrt{\beta_{22}\beta_{33}})} > 0. \end{cases} \tag{1.8}$$

Our first result shows that strict copositivity is a necessary assumption for the nonexistence of nontrivial solutions of (1.1).

Theorem 1.1. *Let $N \leq 3$, suppose that $\beta_{ii} \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and that the matrix $B = (\beta_{ij})_{ij}$ is* not *strictly copositive. Then* (1.1) *admits a nontrivial solution.*

In fact we will prove the following stronger existence result for the Neumann problem corresponding to (1.1) in bounded domains, which immediately gives rise to Theorem 1.1 by tiling $\mathbb{R}^N$ with cubes and reflecting solutions.

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that* $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ *is a bounded domain,* $N \leq 3$, *and that the matrix* $B = (\beta_{ij})_{ij} \in S(n)$ *is* not *strictly copositive but satisfies* $\beta_{ii} \geq 0$ *for* $i = 1, \dots, n$. *Then the Neumann problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_i = \displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} u_j^2 u_i, \quad u_1, \dots, u_n \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \dfrac{\partial u_1}{\partial \nu} = \dfrac{\partial u_2}{\partial \nu} = \dots = \dfrac{\partial u_n}{\partial \nu} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{1.9}$$

admits a nontrivial solution.

We note that the assumption on the nonnegativity of the diagonal elements of B is crucial in Theorem 1.1, which already can be seen by looking at the equation $-\Delta u = -u^3$. By a classical result [20], this equation does not admit nontrivial nonnegative solutions defined on all of $\mathbb{R}^N$. Next, we discuss sufficient conditions for the nonexistence of nontrivial solutions of (1.1). It was observed in [4] that, in the special two component case $n = 2$, the strict copositivity of $B \in S(2)$ is also a sufficient condition. This was proved as follows. Assuming by contradiction that (1.1) admits a nonnegative nontrivial solution $u = (u_1, u_2)$, it was shown that a suitable linear combination $w = \mu_1 u_1 + \mu_2 u_2$ is a positive solution of the differential inequality $-\Delta w \geq w^3$, contrary to a result of Gidas [8]. To exploit the idea in the more general n-component case, we are lead to introduce another notion of positivity of a symmetric matrix B.

Definition 1.1. *We call a matrix* $B \in S(n)$ strictly cubically copositive *if there exists* $\mu \in C_+^n$ *such that*

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} c_j^2 c_i \mu_i > 0 \qquad \text{for all } c \in C_+^n \setminus \{0\}. \tag{1.10}$$

We briefly comment on this definition. By applying (1.10) to coordinate vectors, we see that μ must have strictly positive components to satisfy this condition. Moreover, by homogeneity, there is a constant $\kappa = \kappa(B, \mu) > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} c_j^2 c_i \mu_i \geq \kappa \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mu_i c_i \Big)^3 \qquad \text{for every } c \in C_+^n \setminus \{0\}. \tag{1.11}$$

To explain the degree of freedom given by the choice of μ, we note that if B satisfies

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} c_j^2 c_i \mu_i > 0 \qquad \text{for all } c \in C_+^n \setminus \{0\}.$$

then the matrix $\tilde{B} = \operatorname{diag}(\mu_1^2, \dots, \mu_n^2) B \operatorname{diag}(\mu_1^2, \dots, \mu_n^2)$ with components $\tilde{\beta}_{ij} = \mu_i^2 \beta_{ij} \mu_j^2$ satisfies

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \tilde{\beta}_{ij} c_j^2 c_i > 0 \qquad \text{for all } c \in C_+^n \setminus \{0\}.$$

Our motivation to introduce this notion is given by the following observation.

Proposition 1.1. *Let* $N \leq 3$. *If* $B \in S(n)$ *is strictly cubically copositive, then* (1.1) *does not admit a nontrivial solution.*

Since the proof is very simple, we give it immediately.

Proof. Let $\mu \in C_+^n$ be as in the definition above. We now suppose by contradiction that (1.1) admits a nontrivial solution $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$. Let $\kappa = \kappa(B, \mu) > 0$ satisfy (1.11). Then the positive function $v := \sqrt{\kappa} \sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} \mu_i u_i$ satisfies

$$-\Delta v = \sqrt{\kappa} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} u_j^2 \mu_i u_i \geq \kappa^{\frac{3}{2}} \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mu_i u_i \Big)^3 = v^3 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N,$$

in contradiction, for $N \leq 3$, with the aforementioned result of Gidas [8]. □

It is natural to ask wether strict copositivity and strict cubical copositivity are related in some way. This is answered by the following proposition.

Proposition 1.2. *Let* $B \in S(n)$.

1. *If* B *is strictly cubically copositive, then it is also strictly copositive.*
2. *If* $n = 2$ *and* B *is strictly copositive, then it is also strictly cubically copositive.*

By combining Theorem 1.1 with Propositions 1.1 and 1.2, we immediately get the following

Corollary 1.1. *If* $n = 2$ *and* β_{11}, β_{22} *are nonnegative, then the system (1.1) admits a nontrivial solution if and only if* B *is not strictly copositive, i.e., if one of the strict inequalities*

$$\beta_{11} > 0, \quad \beta_{22} > 0, \quad \beta_{12} > -\sqrt{\beta_{11}\beta_{22}}$$

is not satisfied.

The equivalence of strict copositivity and strict cubic copositivity stated in Proposition 1.2 for $n = 2$ fails to be true if $n \geq 3$. Indeed, for $\varepsilon > 0$ small, the following matrix is strictly copositive but not strictly cubically positive.

$$B_\varepsilon = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1+\varepsilon & -1+\varepsilon \\ -1+\varepsilon & 1 & 1 \\ -1+\varepsilon & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \varepsilon > 0. \tag{1.12}$$

The strict copositivity follows directly from (1.8), but it is not at all obvious that B_ε is not strictly cubically positive. We postpone the proof of this fact to the Appendix. In the multicomponent case $n \geq 3$, the results presented so far still leave a gap between necessary and sufficient conditions for the nonexistence of solutions of (1.1). Somewhat surprisingly, we can close this gap in case $N \leq 2$ but not in the threedimensional case.

Theorem 1.3. *If* $N \leq 2$, $n \geq 2$ *and* $B \in S(n)$ *is strictly copositive, then* (1.1) *does not admit a nontrivial solution.*

By combining Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 we obtain the following result.

Corollary 1.2. *Let* $N \leq 2$ *and let* $B \in S(n)$*,* $n \geq 2$*, be such that* $\beta_{ii} \geq 0$*. Then the system* (1.1) *admits a nontrivial solution if and only if* B *is not strictly copositive.*

The proof of Theorem 1.3 relies on a test function argument which does not extend to the three-dimensional case. Hence in the case $N \geq 3$, $n \geq 3$ it is still open whether nonexistence of nontrivial solutions follows from weaker assumptions than strict cubic copositivity of B. We conjecture that, as in the case $N \leq 2$, strict copositivity is sufficient. Since we are not able to prove this, we add a simple condition on the coefficients of B which guarantees strict cubic copositivity and therefore nonexistence of solutions of (1.1).

Proposition 1.3. *Suppose that*

$$\beta_{ii} > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sum_{\substack{j=1\\ j\neq i}}^{n} \beta_{ij}^{-} > -\beta_{ii} \qquad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where $\beta_{ij}^{-} = \min\{\beta_{ij}, 0\}$*. Then* B *is strictly cubically copositive, and therefore* (1.1) *does not admit a nontrivial solution by Proposition 1.1.*

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we will consider the Neumann problem (1.9), and we will give the proof of Theorem 1.2. The solution is found by variational methods. More precisely, we will consider a $\mathcal{C}^1$-functional E such that critical points of E are precisely (weak) solutions of (1.1). Moreover, we will use the assumption that B is not strictly copositive to set up a suitable minimax principle which eventually gives rise to a nontrivial critical point of E. The difficulty in analyzing the functional geometry of E is the fact that zero is not a minimum but a highly degenerate critical (saddle) point of E.

In Section 3 we will give the proof of our other results presented above which are concerned with matrix properties and nonexistence of solutions of (1.1). Afterwards, in Section 4 we will add some extensions of our results to the more general system

$$-\Delta u_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} u_j^{\frac{p}{2}} u_i^{\frac{p}{2}-1}, \qquad u_1, \dots, u_n \geq 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \tag{1.13}$$

where $2 < p < 2^* = 2N/(N-2)$ if $N \geq 3$ and $2 < p < \infty$ if $N \in \{1, 2\}$.

Finally, in the Appendix we will give the proof that the matrix B_ε defined in (1.12) is not strictly cubically positive for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$.

2. Proof of the existence result

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.2. From now on we assume that the matrix $B = (\beta_{ij})_{ij}$ is *not* strictly copositive, but $\beta_{ii} \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. We wish to show that, in this case, (1.9) admits a nontrivial solution. Without loss of generality, we may from now on assume that

$$Bc \neq 0 \qquad \text{for every } c \in C_+^n \setminus \{0\}. \tag{2.1}$$

Indeed, if there is $c \in C_+^n \setminus \{0\}$ with $Bc = 0$, then the constant vector $u \equiv (\sqrt{c_1}, \dots, \sqrt{c_n})$ is a nontrivial solution of (1.1), and the assertion holds. Moreover, we may also assume that

$$\beta_{ii} > 0 \qquad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n, \tag{2.2}$$

otherwise the i-th coordinate vector e_i is a constant nontrivial solution of (1.9). Next, we consider

$$\partial C_+^n := \{x \in C_+^n \,:\, x_i = 0 \quad \text{for some } i\}.$$

Arguing by induction on n, we may from now on assume that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} c_i c_j > 0 \qquad \text{for all } c \in \partial C_+^n \setminus \{0\}. \tag{2.3}$$

Indeed, if $n = 2$, then (2.2) assures that (2.3) holds. On the other hand, if $n \geq 3$ and $\sum\limits_{i,j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} c_i c_j \leq 0$ for some $c \in \partial C_+^n$ with, say, $c_k = 0$, then we may eliminate the k–th column and the k–th row from B and obtain a matrix $\tilde{B} = (\tilde{\beta}_{ij})_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1)\times(n-1)}$ which is not strictly copositive. By induction, we then get a nontrivial solution $v : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ of the reduced system

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta v_i = \displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \tilde{\beta}_{ij} v_j^2 v_i, \quad v_1, \dots, v_{n-1} \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \dfrac{\partial v_1}{\partial \nu} = \dfrac{\partial v_2}{\partial \nu} = \dots = \dfrac{\partial v_{n-1}}{\partial \nu} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

Then a nontrivial solution of the original problem (1.9) is given by

$$u : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^n, \qquad u = (v_1, \dots, v_{k-1}, 0, v_k, \dots, v_{n-1}).$$

We need to introduce some more notation. We consider the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} := H^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$, endowed with the norm

$$\|u\|^2 := \int_\Omega (|\nabla u|^2 + u^2)\, dx \qquad \text{for } u = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Here and in the following we use the notation

$$|u|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} u_i^2, \qquad |u^-|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (u_i^-)^2 \qquad \text{and} \qquad |\nabla u|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |\nabla u_i|^2.$$

Lemma 2.1. *Consider*

$$E : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad E(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \big(|\nabla u|^2 + |u^-|^2\big)\, dx - \varphi(u),$$

where

$$\varphi(u) := \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \int_\Omega \beta_{ij} (u_i^+)^2 (u_j^+)^2\, dx \qquad \text{for } u \in \mathcal{H}$$

Then we have:

(i) *E is a $\mathcal{C}^1$-functional, and critical points of E are nonnegative solutions of* (1.9).
(ii) *E satisfies the Palais-Smale condition.*

Proof. i) The fact that E is of class $\mathcal{C}^1$ follows from standard arguments in the calculus of variations, using the Sobolev embeddings $\mathcal{H} \hookrightarrow L^2(\Omega)$ and $\mathcal{H} \hookrightarrow L^4(\Omega)$. If $u \in \mathcal{H}$ is a critical point of E, then u satisfies

$$\int_\Omega (\nabla u_i \cdot \nabla \varphi + u_i^- \varphi)\, dx = \sum_{j=1}^n \int_\Omega \beta_{ij} (u_j^+)^2 u_i^+ \varphi\, dx$$

for $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$ and $i = 1, \dots, n$. By choosing $\varphi = u_i^-$, we obtain

$$\int_\Omega (|\nabla u_i^-|^2 + |u_i^-|^2)\, dx = 0 \qquad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

This implies that $u_i^- \equiv 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and hence $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$ is a solution of (1.9).
ii) Let $(u_k)_k \subset \mathcal{H}$ be a sequence such that $E(u_k)$ remains bounded and $E'(u_k) \to 0$ in the dual space $\mathcal{H}'$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{o}(\|u_k\|) = E'(u_k)u_k &= \int_\Omega \big(|\nabla u_k|^2 + |u_k^-|^2\big) dx - \sum_{i,j=1}^n \int_\Omega \beta_{ij} ((u_k^i)^+)^2 ((u_k^j)^+)^2\, dx \\ &= 4E(u_k) - \int_\Omega \big(|\nabla u_k|^2 + |u_k^-|^2\big) dx, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$\int_\Omega \big(|\nabla u_k|^2 + |u_k^-|^2\big) dx \le C + \mathrm{o}(\|u_k\|) \qquad \text{as } k \to +\infty, \tag{2.5}$$

for some constant $C > 0$. We now suppose by contradiction that $(u_k)_k$ is unbounded in $\mathcal{H}$, hence $\|u_k\| \to \infty$ up to a subsequence. Define $v_k := \frac{u_k}{\|u_k\|}$. Then $\|v_k\| = 1$ for all k and $\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_\Omega \big(|\nabla v_k|^2 + (v_k^-)^2\big) dx = 0$, so we may pass to a subsequence such that $v_k \to v$ in $\mathcal{H}$, where $v \neq 0$ is a constant vector with $v_i \ge 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Moreover, for arbitrary $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$ and $i = 1, \dots, n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^n \beta_{ij} v_j^2 v_i \int_\Omega \varphi\, dx = \sum_{j=1}^n \int_\Omega \beta_{ij} (v_j^+)^2 (v_i^+) \varphi\, dx &= \\ = \lim_{k\to\infty} \|u_k\|^{-3} \sum_{j=1}^n \int_\Omega \beta_{ij} ((u_k^j)^+)^2 (u_k^i)^+ \varphi\, dx &= \\ = \lim_{k\to\infty} \|u_k\|^{-3} \Big(\partial_i E(u_k)\varphi - \int_\Omega \big(\nabla u_k^i \cdot \nabla \varphi + (u_k^i)^- \varphi\big)\, dx \Big) &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} v_j^2 v_i = 0 \qquad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n.$$

If $v \in \partial C_+^n \setminus \{0\}$, this obviously contradicts (2.3). On the other hand, if $v \in \operatorname{int}(C_+^n)$, then $\sum_{j=1}^n \beta_{ij} v_j^2 = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, contradicting (2.1).
We therefore conclude that $\|u_n\|$ is bounded. Next, we note that $\nabla E(u_n) = u_n - A(u_n)$ with

$$A : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}, \qquad Aw = (-\Delta + 1)^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} w_1^+ + \sum\limits_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{1j} (w_j^+)^2 w_1^+ \\ \vdots \\ w_n^+ + \sum\limits_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{nj} (w_j^+)^2 w_n^+ \end{pmatrix},$$

i.e., the i-th component $(Aw)_i$ of Aw is uniquely given by

$$\int_\Omega \Big(\nabla (Aw)_i \cdot \nabla \varphi + (Aw)_i \, \varphi \Big) \, dx = \int_\Omega \Big(w_i^+ \varphi + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} (w_j^+)^2 w_i^+ \varphi \Big) \, dx,$$

for all $\varphi \in H^1(\Omega)$. By the compactness of the embeddings $\mathcal{H} \hookrightarrow L^3(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$ and $\mathcal{H} \hookrightarrow L^1(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^n)$, we see that A is also a compact operator. Hence we may pass to a subsequence of $(u_k)_k$ such that $A(u_k) \to \bar{u}$ in $\mathcal{H}$. But then also

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} (u_k - \bar{u}) = \lim_{k \to \infty} (u_k - A(u_k)) = \lim_{k \to \infty} \nabla E(u_k) = 0.$$

Hence $u_k \to \bar{u}$ strongly in $\mathcal{H}$, which was claimed. □

In order to prove Theorem 1.2, our goal is to set up a minimax principle which gives rise to a positive critical value of E. For this we need some preparations. We let $b : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ denote the quadratic form associated with B, i.e.,

$$b(c) = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} \, c_i c_j \qquad \text{for } c \in \mathbb{R}^n. \tag{2.6}$$

By the assumption that B is not strictly copositive and by (2.3), there exists $d := (d_1, \dots, d_k) \in \operatorname{int}(C_+^n)$ such that $b(d) \le 0$. In fact, we can find $d \in \operatorname{int}(C_+^n)$ such that $b(d) < 0$, since otherwise $\min\limits_{C_+^n} b = 0$ would be attained at a point $c \in \operatorname{int}(C_+^n)$ satisfying $0 = \nabla b(c) = 2Bc$, contradicting (2.1).
From now on we fix $d \in \operatorname{int}(C_+^n)$ such that $b(d^2) < 0$, where $d^2 := (d_1^2, \dots, d_n^2)$. We define the linear map

$$\mathcal{L} : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R}^n, \qquad \mathcal{L}u = \Big(\int_\Omega u_1 \, dx, \dots, \int_\Omega u_n \, dx \Big) \tag{2.7}$$

and, for $\lambda > 0$, the sets

$$M_\lambda := \{ u \in \mathcal{H} \, : \, \|u\| = \lambda, \ \mathcal{L}u \in \mathbb{R}d \}.$$

Lemma 2.2. *There exists* $\lambda > 0$ *such that*

$$\sigma_\lambda := \inf_{M_\lambda} E > 0. \tag{2.8}$$

Proof. We first show that there exists $\kappa_1 > 0$ such that

$$\max\Big\{-\varphi(u), \Big(\int_\Omega \big(|\nabla u|^2 + |u^-|^2\big)\,dx\Big)^2\Big\} \geq \kappa_1 \qquad \text{for all } u \in M_1. \tag{2.9}$$

Indeed, suppose by contradiction that there exists a sequence $(u_k)_k \subset M_1$ such that

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \varphi(u_k) \geq 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_\Omega \big(|\nabla u_k|^2 + |u_k^-|^2\big)\,dx = 0.$$

Since $\|u_k\| = 1$ for all k, we may pass to a subsequence such that $u_k \to u$ in $\mathcal{H}$ as $k \to \infty$, where $u \neq 0$ is a constant vector with $u_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. By continuity of the map $\mathcal{L}$ and the functional φ, we find that

$$\mathcal{L}u \in \mathbb{R}d \qquad \text{and} \qquad \varphi(u) \geq 0. \tag{2.10}$$

Since u is a constant vector, we conclude that $u \equiv \lambda d$ for some $\lambda > 0$. By the choice of d we deduce that $\varphi(u) < 0$, contrary to (2.10). Thus we have proved (2.9). By homogeneity, we deduce that, for every $\lambda > 0$,

$$\max\{-\varphi(u), \Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 + |u^-|^2\big)\,dx\Big)^2\} \geq \kappa_1\lambda^4 \qquad \text{for all } u \in M_\lambda.$$

On the other hand, it is also clear that there exists $\kappa_2 > 0$ independent of $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$\varphi(u) \leq \kappa_2\|u\|^4 = \kappa_2\lambda^4 \qquad \text{for all } u \in M_\lambda.$$

We now claim that (2.8) holds for $\lambda = \frac{\sqrt[4]{\kappa_1}}{2\sqrt{\kappa_2}}$. Indeed, let $u \in M_\lambda$. Then

$$-\varphi(u) \geq \kappa_1\lambda^4 \qquad \text{or} \qquad \int_\Omega \big(|\nabla u|^2 + |u^-|^2\big)\,dx \geq \sqrt{\kappa_1}\lambda^2.$$

In the first case we have

$$E(u) = \int_\Omega \big(|\nabla u|^2 + |u^-|^2\big)\,dx - \varphi(u) \geq \kappa_1\lambda^4 > 0,$$

whereas in the second case

$$E(u) \geq \frac{\sqrt{\kappa_1}\lambda^2}{2} - \kappa_2\lambda^4 = \lambda^2(\frac{\sqrt{\kappa_1}}{2} - \kappa_2\lambda^2) = \frac{\sqrt{\kappa_1}}{4}\lambda^2 > 0.$$

We thus have established (2.8). □

From now on we fix $\lambda > 0$ such that (2.8) holds, and we fix functions $\varphi_i \in C^2(\overline{\Omega})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ such that $0 \leq \varphi_i \leq 1$, $\varphi_i \not\equiv 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $\varphi_i\,\varphi_j \equiv 0$ for $i \neq j$. We also put

$$\kappa := \min_{1\leq i\leq n} \int_\Omega \varphi_i^2(x)\,dx > 0.$$

We define the map

$$h : C_+^n \to \mathcal{H}, \qquad c \mapsto h_c = (c_1\varphi_1, \dots, c_n\varphi_n). \tag{2.11}$$

Then we have

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}\int_{\Omega}\beta_{ij}(h_c^i)^2(h_c^j)^2\,dx=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\beta_{ii}\,c_i^4\int_{\Omega}\varphi_i^4(x)\,dx>0\qquad\text{for every } c\in C_+^n\setminus\{0\},$$

which by homogeneity implies that there exists $\kappa_3>0$ such that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}\int_{\Omega}\beta_{ij}(h_c^i)^2(h_c^j)^2\,dx>\kappa_3|c|^4\qquad\text{for every } c\in C_+^n\setminus\{0\}.$$

As a consequence, there exists $R_1>0$ such that

$$E(h_c)\le\frac{|c|^2}{2}\Big(\max_{1\le i\le n}\int_{\Omega}|\nabla\varphi_i|^2\Big)-\frac{\kappa_3}{4}|c|^4\le 0\qquad\text{for } c\in C_+^n \text{ with } |c|\ge R_1.\tag{2.12}$$

Next we consider the homotopy

$$C_+^n\times[0,1]\to\mathcal{H},\qquad (c,t)\mapsto h_{c,t}\quad\text{with } h_{c,t}(x)=(1-t)c+th_c(x).$$

We note that $h_{c,t}(C_+^n)\subset\partial C_+^n$ for $c\in\partial C_+^n$, $0\le t\le 1$, and therefore (2.3) implies that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n}\int_{\Omega}\beta_{ij}(h_{c,t}^i)^2(h_{c,t}^j)^2\,dx>0\qquad\text{for every } c\in\partial C_+^n\setminus\{0\},\ t\in[0,1].$$

By reasoning exactly as in (2.12) we deduce the existence of $R_2>0$ such that

$$E(h_{c,t})\le 0\qquad\text{for every } c\in\partial C_+^n\setminus\{0\}\text{ such that } |c|\ge R_2,\ t\in[0,1].\tag{2.13}$$

Moreover, recalling that $0\le\varphi_i\le 1$, we see that

$$\|h_{c,t}\|^2\ge\sum_{i=1}^{n}c_i^2\int_{\Omega}\big[(1-t)+t\varphi_i(x)\big]^2\,dx\ge\sum_{i=1}^{n}c_i^2\int_{\Omega}\varphi_i^2(x)\,dx\ge\kappa|c|^2$$

for $0\le t\le 1$, $c\in C_+^n$ and therefore

$$\|h_{c,t}\|>\lambda\qquad\text{for } 0\le t\le 1 \text{ and } c\in C_+^n \text{ with } |c|\ge R_3:=\frac{\lambda+1}{\sqrt{\kappa}}.\tag{2.14}$$

Finally we take $D:=B_{R+1}(0)\cap C_+^n$ with $R:=\max\{R_1,R_2,R_3\}$. We define the continuous function

$$\Theta: D\to\mathcal{H},\qquad\begin{cases}\Theta(c)=c & \text{if } c\in B_R(0)\cap C_+^n,\\ \Theta(c)=h_{c,|c|-R} & \text{if } c\in\big(B_{R+1}(0)\setminus B_R(0)\big)\cap C_+^n,\\ \Theta(c)=h_c & \text{if } c\in C_+^n\setminus B_{R+1}(0),\end{cases}$$

By combining (2.3) with (2.12) and (2.13) we see that

$$E(\Theta(c))\le 0\qquad\text{for every } c\in\partial D.\tag{2.15}$$

We are now in a position to define a minimax value for E.

Proposition 2.1. *Let*

$$\mathcal{T} := \{\gamma : D \to \mathcal{H} :\ \gamma \text{ continuous, } \gamma|_{\partial D} = \Theta\} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sigma := \inf_{\gamma\in\mathcal{T}} \sup_{c\in D} E(\gamma(c)).$$

Then $\sigma \geq \sigma_\lambda > 0$, and σ is a critical value of E.

Proof. We first show that

$$\gamma(D) \cap M_\lambda \neq \emptyset \qquad \text{for any } \gamma \in \mathcal{T}, \tag{2.16}$$

then Lemma 2.2 immediately yields $\sigma \geq \sigma_\lambda > 0$. To prove the intersection property (2.16), we will use classical degree theory (see e.g. [23, Appendix D]). For this we define

$$\mathcal{K} : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R}^n, \qquad \mathcal{K}u = \|u\|^2 d + P(\mathcal{L}u)$$

where $\mathcal{L}$ is defined in (2.7) and $P : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is the orthogonal projection onto $d^\perp := \{c \in \mathbb{R}^n \ :\ c \cdot e = 0\}$. We observe that (2.16) holds if and only if

$$\lambda^2 d \ \in\ [\mathcal{K} \circ \gamma](D) \qquad \text{for any } \gamma \in \mathcal{T}. \tag{2.17}$$

We first consider $\gamma = \Theta$. As a consequence of (2.14) and the definition of Θ, we have for $c \in \overline{D}$

$$\mathcal{K}(\Theta(c)) = \lambda^2 d \qquad \text{if and only if} \qquad c = \mu d \text{ with } \mu = \frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{|\Omega|}|d|}$$

Moreover $\mu d \in B_R(0) \cap C^n_+$ and hence, for c in a neighborhood of μd in $\mathbb{R}^n$ we have $\mathcal{K}(\Theta(c)) = |\Omega|\Big(|c|^2 d + Pc\Big)$, so that the derivative of $\mathcal{K} \circ \Theta$ at μd is given by

$$[\mathcal{K} \circ \Theta]'(\mu d)e = |\Omega|\Big(2\mu[d \cdot e]d + Pe\Big) \qquad \text{for } e \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

If we choose a basis of $\mathbb{R}^n$ of the type $\{d, e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}\}$, where $\{e_1, \dots, e_{n-1}\}$ is a basis of the subspace $d^\perp$, then the matrix of the linear map $[\mathcal{K} \circ \Theta]'(\mu d)$ in such basis is given by $\mathrm{diag}(2\mu|d|^2|\Omega|, |\Omega|, \dots, |\Omega|)$. Hence the Jacobian determinant of $\mathcal{K} \circ \Theta$ at μd is $2|\Omega|^n \mu |d|^2 > 0$ and therefore $\deg(\mathcal{K} \circ \Theta, D, \lambda d) = 1$. Consequently, we also have $\deg(\mathcal{K} \circ \gamma, D, \lambda d) = 1$ for every $\gamma \in \mathcal{T}$ by standard properties of the degree, since $\gamma \equiv \Theta$ on ∂D. Hence (2.17) and therefore (2.16) holds.

We still need to prove that σ is a critical value of E. We argue by contradiction and assume that this is not the case. Then, since E satisfies the Palais-Smale condition, there exists $\varepsilon \in (0, \frac{\sigma}{2})$ such that

$$\|\nabla E(u)\| \geq \varepsilon \qquad \text{for all } u \in \mathcal{H} \text{ with } \sigma - 2\varepsilon \leq E(u) \leq \sigma + 2\varepsilon.$$

Now the quantitative deformation lemma (see [23, Lemma 2.3]) yields a continuous map $\eta : \mathcal{H} \to \mathcal{H}$ such that

$$E(\eta(u)) \leq \sigma - \varepsilon \qquad \text{whenever } E(u) \leq \sigma + \varepsilon$$

and

$$\eta(u) = u \qquad \text{whenever } E(u) \leq \sigma - 2\varepsilon$$

Now let $\gamma \in \mathcal{T}$ with $\sup\limits_{c \in D} E(\gamma(c)) \le \sigma + \varepsilon$. Since $E \circ \gamma = E \circ \Theta \le 0$ on ∂D, we infer that $\eta \circ \gamma = \gamma = \Theta$ on ∂D and therefore $\eta \circ \gamma \in \mathcal{T}$. This yields

$$c \le \sup_{\eta \circ \gamma(D)} E \le \sigma - \varepsilon,$$

a contradiction. We conclude that σ is a critical value of E, as claimed. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2 (completed). By Proposition 2.1, there exists a nontrivial critical point of E, which by Lemma 2.1-(i) is a solution of (1.9). □

3. Nonexistence results and matrix conditions

In this Section we will give the proof of Theorem 1.3 and Propositions 1.2 and 1.3. We start with the

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Suppose by contradiction that (1.1) admits a nontrivial solution. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $u_i > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. For $R > 0$, consider the function

$$f_R : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad \begin{cases} f_R(r) = 1 & \text{if } r \le R, \\ f_R(r) = \dfrac{\log(r/R^2)}{\log(1/R)} & \text{if } R \le r \le R^2, \\ f_R(r) = 0 & \text{if } r \ge R^2. \end{cases}$$

For $N = 1, 2$, if we take the radial function $\varphi_R \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^N)$, $\varphi_R(x) = f_R(|x|)$, we then have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla \varphi_R|^2 \, dx \to 0 \qquad \text{as } R \to \infty.$$

In fact, for $N = 1$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\nabla \varphi_R|^2 \, dx = \frac{2}{\log^2 R} \int_R^{R^2} \frac{1}{r^2} \, dr = 2 \left(\frac{1}{R} - \frac{1}{R^2} \right) \frac{1}{\log^2 R} \to 0 \qquad \text{as } R \to \infty,$$

whereas for $N = 2$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \varphi_R|^2 \, dx = \frac{2\pi}{\log^2 R} \int_R^{R^2} \frac{1}{r} \, dr = \frac{2\pi}{\log R} \to 0 \qquad \text{as } R \to \infty.$$

Now, multiplying (1.1) with $\frac{\varphi_R^2}{u_i}$ and integrating by parts, we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \beta_{ij} \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_j^2 \varphi_R^2 \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{-\Delta u_i}{u_i} \varphi_R^2 \, dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \nabla u_i \cdot \left(\frac{2\varphi_R \nabla \varphi_R}{u_i} - \varphi_R^2 \frac{\nabla u_i}{u_i^2} \right) dx$$
$$= - \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left| \frac{\varphi_R}{u_i} \nabla u_i - \nabla \varphi_R \right|^2 dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla \varphi_R|^2 \, dx \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla \varphi_R|^2 \, dx = \mathrm{o}(1)$$

as $R \to \infty$. Next we let $c_j(R) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_j^2 \varphi_R^2 \, dx$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$. By multiplying the above inequality with $c_i(R)$ and summing over i, we obtain from the strict copositivity of the matrix B

$$0 \leq \text{const} \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i^2(R) \leq \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} c_i(R) c_j(R) \leq \text{o}(1) \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i(R) \qquad \text{as } R \to \infty,$$

Thus $\int_{B_R(0)} u_i^2 \leq \text{o}(1) \to 0$ as $R \to +\infty$ and hence $u_i \equiv 0$ for every i, contrary to what we have assumed. □

Proof of Proposition 1.2. First we show i), so we assume that $B \in S(n)$ is strictly cubically copositive. Hence there exists $\mu \in C_+^n$ such that $\sum\limits_{i,j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} c_i^2 c_j \mu_j > 0$ for every $c \in C_+^n \setminus \{0\}$. To show strict copositivity of B, we need to prove that $b(c) > 0$ for $c \in C_+^n \setminus \{0\}$, where $b : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ denotes the quadratic form associated with B (see (2.6)) or, equivalently, that $\tilde{b}(c) = b(c^2) = b(c_1^2, \dots, c_n^2) > 0$ for $c \in C_+^n \setminus \{0\}$. For a nonempty subset $\mathcal{N} \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$, we put

$$C_{\mathcal{N}} := \{c \in C_+^n \setminus \{0\} \ : \ c_i = 0 \ \text{ for } i \notin \mathcal{N}\}.$$

Arguing by induction on $|\mathcal{N}|$, we prove that, for every $\mathcal{N} \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$,

$$\tilde{b}(c) > 0 \qquad \text{for all } c \in C_{\mathcal{N}}. \tag{3.1}$$

If $|\mathcal{N}| = 1$, then $\mathcal{N} = \{i\}$ for some $i = 1, \dots, n$, and choosing $c = e_i$ in Definition 1.1 immediately gives $\beta_{ii} > 0$ and therefore (3.1).
Next we fix $l \in \{2, \dots, k\}$, and we suppose that (3.1) holds for all $\mathcal{N}$ with $|\mathcal{N}| \leq l-1$. For each $\mathcal{N}_*$ with $|\mathcal{N}_*| = l$, we consider $\tilde{\mu} = (\tilde{\mu}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mu}_n) \in C_+^n$, where $\tilde{\mu}_i = \mu_i$ if $i \in \mathcal{N}_*$ and $\tilde{\mu}_i = 0$ if $i \notin \mathcal{N}_*$. We note that for every $c \in C_{\mathcal{N}_*}$ we have

$$\partial_{\tilde{\mu}} \tilde{b}(c) = \nabla \left(\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} c_i^2 c_j^2 \right) \cdot \tilde{\mu} = 4 \sum_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}_*} \beta_{ij} c_j^2 c_i \tilde{\mu}_i = 4 \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} c_i^2 c_j \mu_j > 0$$

As a consequence, by integrating the previous expression we deduce that $\tilde{b}(c) > 0$ for all c that can be written as $c = \hat{c} + t\tilde{\mu}$ with $\hat{c} = 0$ or $\hat{c} \in C_{\mathcal{N}}$ for some $\mathcal{N}$ with $|\mathcal{N}| \leq l-1$ and $t > 0$. Since every $c \in C_{\mathcal{N}_*}$ can be written in this way, we conclude that (3.1) holds for every element of $C_{\mathcal{N}_*}$.
Next we prove ii), arguing somewhat more directly than in [4, Theorem 2.1]. Let

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_{11} & \beta_{12} \\ \beta_{12} & \beta_{22} \end{pmatrix} \quad \in \quad S(2)$$

be strictly copositive, so that $\beta_{11}, \beta_{22} > 0$ and $\beta_{12} > -\sqrt{\beta_{11}\beta_{22}}$ by (1.7). To show the strict cubic copositivity of B, we consider the vector $\mu := (\frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{\beta_{11}}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{\beta_{11}}}) \in C_+^2$. Take an arbitrary $c = (c_1, c_2) \in C_+^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}$. If either $c_1 = 0$ or $c_2 = 0$ then $\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \beta_{ij} c_j^2 \mu_i c_i$ is either equal to $\beta_{22} c_2^3 \mu_2 > 0$ or $\beta_{11} c_1^3 \mu_1 > 0$ respectively. Suppose now that $c_1, c_2 \neq 0$

and put $\tilde{c}_i = c_i \sqrt[4]{\beta_{ii}}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \beta_{ij} c_j^2 \mu_i c_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{\beta_{11}}} (\beta_{11} c_1^3 + \beta_{12} c_2^2 c_1) + \frac{1}{\sqrt[4]{\beta_{22}}} (\beta_{22} c_2^3 + \beta_{12} c_1^2 c_2)$$

$$= \tilde{c}_1^3 + \tilde{c}_2^3 + \frac{\beta_{12}}{\sqrt{\beta_{11}\beta_{22}}} (\tilde{c}_2^2 \tilde{c}_1 + \tilde{c}_1^2 \tilde{c}_2) > \tilde{c}_1^3 + \tilde{c}_2^3 - (\tilde{c}_2^2 \tilde{c}_1 + \tilde{c}_1^2 \tilde{c}_2) \geq 0,$$

as required. □

Proof of Proposition 1.3. Using the simple inequality $s^2 t + s t^2 \leq s^3 + t^3$ for $s, t \geq 0$ and the fact that $B = (\beta_{ij})_{ij}$ is symmetric, we obtain

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} c_j^2 c_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_{ii} c_i^3 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^{n} \beta_{ij}^- (c_j^2 c_i + c_i^2 c_j) \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_{ii} c_i^3 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^{n} \beta_{ij}^- (c_i^3 + c_j^3)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_{ii} c_i^3 + \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^{n} \beta_{ij}^- c_i^3 = \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i^3 \Big(\beta_{ii} + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{n} \beta_{ij}^- \Big) \qquad \text{for } c \in C_+^n.$$

Moreover, since

$$\kappa_0 := \min_{i=1,\dots,n} \Big(\beta_{ii} + \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^{n} \beta_{ij}^- \Big) > 0$$

we infer that $\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} c_j^2 c_i \geq \kappa_0 \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i^3 > 0$ for every $c \in C_+^n \setminus \{0\}$. □

4. RESULTS FOR SYSTEMS WITH MORE GENERAL POWER-TYPE NONLINEARITIES

Some of the results that we have obtained for the cubic system (1.1) can be extended to more general systems such as

$$-\Delta u_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} u_j^{\frac{p}{2}} u_i^{\frac{p}{2}-1}, \qquad u_1, \dots, u_n \geq 0 \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N, \tag{4.1}$$

where now the dimension N is arbitrary and $2 < p < 2^* = 2N/(N-2)$ if $N \geq 3$ and $2 < p < \infty$ if $N \in \{1, 2\}$ (in fact, in this setting, the picture is less clear, and at the moment we need some further restriction on p, see below). In this section we state and prove such extensions. Observe that (4.1) reduces to (1.1) when $p = 4$.

Most of the techniques used in the proofs will be simple adaptations of the ones used in the previous two sections. In such cases, we will only provide a sketch of the proof, stressing the major differences with respect to the cubic case.

Concerning the existence of nontrivial solutions of (4.1), we have the following.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that $2 < p < 2^* = 2N/(N-2)$ if $N \geq 3$ and $2 < p < \infty$ if $N \in \{1, 2\}$. Suppose furthermore that $\beta_{ii} \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and that the matrix $B = (\beta_{ij})_{ij} \in S(n)$ is* not *strictly copositive. Then (4.1) admits a nontrivial solution.*

As already discussed in the special case $p = 4$, this result is an immediate consequence of the following

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose that $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^N$ is a bounded domain, $2 < p < 2^*$ if $N \geq 3$ and $2 < p < \infty$ if $N \leq 2$. Suppose moreover that the matrix $B = (\beta_{ij})_{ij} \in S(n)$ is* not *strictly copositive but satisfies $\beta_{ii} \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then the Neumann problem*

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_i = \displaystyle\sum_{j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} u_j^{\frac{p}{2}} u_i^{\frac{p}{2}-1}, \quad u_1, \dots, u_n \geq 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ \dfrac{\partial u_1}{\partial \nu} = \dfrac{\partial u_2}{\partial \nu} = \dots = \dfrac{\partial u_n}{\partial \nu} = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{4.2}$$

admits a nontrivial solution.

We briefly outline the proof of Theorem 4.2 and point out the adjustments which have to be made. Exactly as in the proof of Theorem 1.2, one can suppose without loss of generality that

$$Bc \neq 0 \qquad \text{for every } c \in C_+^n \setminus \{0\}. \tag{4.3}$$

(otherwise we have a constant solution of the type $u \equiv (\sqrt[p]{c_1^2}, \dots, \sqrt[p]{c_n^2})$). Moreover, we may also assume that $\beta_{ii} > 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} c_i c_j > 0 \qquad \text{for all } c \in \partial C_+^n \setminus \{0\}. \tag{4.4}$$

Now, we consider the functional

$$E_p : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbb{R}, \qquad E(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_\Omega \left(|\nabla u|^2 + |u^-|^2 \right) dx - \varphi_p(u),$$

where

$$\varphi_p(u) := \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \int_\Omega \beta_{ij} (u_i^+)^{\frac{p}{2}} (u_j^+)^{\frac{p}{2}} \, dx \qquad \text{for } u \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Again we have that E_p satisfies the Palais-Smale condition and that critical points of E_p are nonnegative solutions of (4.2). Choosing now $d \in \text{int}(C_+^n)$ such that $b(d^{\frac{p}{2}}) = b(d_1^{\frac{p}{2}}, \dots, d_n^{\frac{p}{2}}) < 0$ and defining

$$M_\lambda := \{ u \in \mathcal{H} \, : \, \|u\| = \lambda, \, \mathcal{L}u \in \mathbb{R}d \},$$

we can prove that

$$\max\{-\varphi(u), \Big(\int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 + |u^-|^2 \big) \, dx \Big)^{\frac{p}{2}} \} \geq \kappa_1 \lambda^p \qquad \text{and} \qquad \varphi(u) \leq \kappa_2 \|u\|^p = \kappa_2 \lambda^p$$

for all $u \in M_\lambda$ with constants $\kappa_1, \kappa_2 > 0$. From this we then deduce that

$$\sigma_\lambda := \inf_{M_\lambda} E_p > 0 \qquad \text{for } \lambda = \frac{\kappa_1^{\frac{2}{p(p-2)}}}{(4\kappa_2)^{\frac{1}{p-2}}}.$$

The rest of the proof, namely the minimax principle relying on the construction of the set $D \subset C_+^n$ and the map $\Theta : D \to \mathcal{H}$, can be carried out exactly as in the special case $p = 4$, see Section 2.
Next, we turn to the nonexistence results. Having once more the results of Gidas [8] in mind, we start by generalizing the notion of strict cubic copositivity. Therefore in the following we will call a matrix $B \in S(n)$ *strictly $(p-1)$–copositive* if there exists $\mu \in C_+^n$ such that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} c_j^{\frac{p}{2}} c_i^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \mu_i > 0 \qquad \text{for all } c \in C_+^n \setminus \{0\}. \tag{4.5}$$

This notion gives rise to the following nonexistence result for (4.2).

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose that $2 < p \leq \frac{2N-2}{N-2}$ if $N \geq 3$ and $2 < p < \infty$ if $N \leq 2$. If $B \in S(n)$ is strictly $(p-1)$–copositive, then* (4.1) *does not admit a nontrivial solution.*

Proof. Let $\mu \in C_+^n$ be as in the definition above and take $\kappa = \kappa(B, \mu) > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} c_j^{\frac{p}{2}} c_i^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \mu_i \geq \kappa \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mu_i c_i \right)^{p-1}.$$

Suppose by contradiction that (4.1) admits a nontrivial solution $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$. Then the positive function $v := \kappa^{\frac{1}{p-2}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mu_i u_i$ satisfies

$$-\Delta v = \kappa^{\frac{1}{p-2}} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} u_j^{\frac{p}{2}} u_i^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \mu_i \geq \kappa^{\frac{p-1}{p-2}} \Big(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mu_i u_i \Big)^{p-1} = v^{p-1} \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N.$$

By the result of Gidas [8], this is impossible since $p - 1 \leq \frac{N}{N-2}$ by assumption. □

Concerning the relationship between strict copositivity and strict $(p-1)$–copositivity, we have the following generalization of Proposition 1.2

Proposition 4.2. *Let $B \in S(n)$.*

1. *If B is strictly $(p-1)$–copositive for some $p > 2$, then it is also strictly copositive.*
2. *If $n = 2$ and B is strictly copositive, then it is also strictly $(p-1)$–copositive for every $p > 2$.*

Proof. i) Defining $\tilde{b}(c) = b(c^{\frac{p}{2}}) = b(c_1^{\frac{p}{2}}, \dots, c_n^{\frac{p}{2}})$ for $c \in C^n$, we can show similarly as in the proof of Proposition 1.2 that $\tilde{b}$ is strictly positive on $C_n^+ \setminus \{0\}$, hence the same is true for b.
ii) Let $B = (\beta_{ij}) \in S(2)$ be strictly copositive, so that $\beta_{11}, \beta_{22} > 0$ and $\beta_{12} > -\sqrt{\beta_{11}\beta_{22}}$. To show the strict $(p-1)$–copositivity of B, we now consider $\mu := (\frac{1}{\sqrt[p]{\beta_{11}}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt[p]{\beta_{11}}}) \in C_+^n$. Take an arbitrary $c = (c_1, c_2) \in C_+^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}$. If either $c_1 = 0$

or $c_2 = 0$ then $\sum_{i,j=1}^2 \beta_{ij} c_j^{\frac{p}{2}} \mu_i c_i^{\frac{p}{2}-1}$ is either equal to $\beta_{22} c_2^{p-1} \mu_2 > 0$ or $\beta_{11} c_1^{p-1} \mu_1 > 0$ respectively. Suppose now that $c_1, c_2 \neq 0$ and put $\tilde{c}_i = c_i \sqrt[p]{\beta_{ii}}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Then

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \beta_{ij} c_j^{\frac{p}{2}} \mu_i c_i^{\frac{p}{2}-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt[p]{\beta_{11}}} \left(\beta_{11} c_1^{p-1} + \beta_{12} c_2^{\frac{p}{2}} c_1^{\frac{p}{2}-1}\right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt[p]{\beta_{22}}} \left(\beta_{22} c_2^{p-1} + \beta_{12} c_1^{\frac{p}{2}} c_2^{\frac{p}{2}-1}\right)$$

$$= \tilde{c}_1^{p-1} + \tilde{c}_2^{p-1} + \frac{\beta_{12}}{\sqrt{\beta_{11}\beta_{22}}} \left(\tilde{c}_2^{\frac{p}{2}} \tilde{c}_1^{\frac{p}{2}-1} + \tilde{c}_1^{\frac{p}{2}} \tilde{c}_2^{\frac{p}{2}-1}\right) > \tilde{c}_1^{p-1} + \tilde{c}_2^{p-1} - \left(\tilde{c}_2^{\frac{p}{2}} \tilde{c}_1^{\frac{p}{2}-1} + \tilde{c}_1^{\frac{p}{2}} \tilde{c}_2^{\frac{p}{2}-1}\right) \geq 0,$$

as required. □

By combining Theorem 4.1 with Propositions 4.1 and 4.2, we immediately get the following

Corollary 4.1. *Take $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $2 < p \leq \frac{2N-2}{N-2}$ if $N \geq 3$, $2 < p < \infty$ if $N \leq 2$. Let $n = 2$. If β_{11}, β_{22} are nonnegative, then the system (4.1) admits a nontrivial solution if and only if B is not strictly copositive, i.e., if one of the strict inequalities*

$$\beta_{11} > 0, \quad \beta_{22} > 0, \quad \beta_{12} > -\sqrt{\beta_{11}\beta_{22}}$$

is not satisfied.

Generalizing Theorem 1.3, we can also derive sharp nonexistence results for the case of $n \geq 3$ components in dimensions $N = 1, 2$. However, we have to restrict our attention to the case $2 < p \leq 4$, and the proof is somewhat more complicated than in the case $p = 4$.

Theorem 4.3. *If $N \leq 2$, $2 < p \leq 4$ and $B \in S(n)$ is strictly copositive, then* (4.1) *does not admit a nontrivial solution.*

Proof. Suppose by contradiction that (4.1) admits a nontrivial solution. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $u_i > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. For $R > 0$, consider the function φ_R defined in the proof of Theorem 1.3. We recall that for $N = 1, 2$ we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} |\nabla \varphi_R|^2 \, dx \to 0 \qquad \text{as } R \to \infty.$$

Observe moreover that $|\nabla \varphi_R| \leq C$ for some $C > 0$ independent of $R > 0$.
For $p = 4$ the result of Theorem (4.3) is exactly the content of Theorem 1.3. Fix $2 < p < 4$ and let $a \in (2, +\infty)$ be such that $p = \frac{4a}{2a-2}$. Multiplying (1.1) with $\varphi_R^a u_i^{1-\frac{p}{2}}$

and integrating by parts, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=1}^n \beta_{ij}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_j^{\frac p2}\varphi_R^a\,dx &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} -\Delta u_i \varphi_R^a u_i^{1-\frac p2}\,dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\nabla u_i\cdot\nabla\Big(\varphi_R^a u_i^{1-\frac p2}\Big)\,dx\\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\nabla u_i\cdot\Big(a\varphi_R^{a-1}u_i^{1-\frac p2}\nabla\varphi_R-\Big(\frac{p-2}{2}\Big)\varphi_R^a u_i^{-\frac p2}\nabla u_i\Big)\,dx\\ &= -\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\Big|\sqrt{\frac{p-2}{2}}\varphi_R^{\frac a2}u_i^{-\frac p4}\nabla u_i-\frac a2\sqrt{\frac{2}{p-2}}\varphi_R^{\frac a2-1}u_i^{1-\frac p4}\nabla\varphi\Big|^2\,dx+\\ &\quad+\frac{a^2}{2(p-2)}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\varphi_R^{a-2}u_i^{\frac{4-p}{2}}|\nabla\varphi|^2\,dx\\ &\le \frac{a^2}{2(p-2)}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\varphi_R^{a-2}u_i^{\frac{4-p}{2}}|\nabla\varphi|^2\,dx.\end{aligned}$$

Next we let $c_j(R) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^N} u_j^{\frac p2}\varphi_R^a\,dx$ for $j = 1,\dots,n$. By multiplying the above inequality with $c_i(R)$ and summing over i, we obtain from the strict copositivity of the matrix B

$$\begin{aligned}0\le\kappa_1\sum_{i=1}^n c_i^2(R)\le\sum_{i,j=1}^n\beta_{ij}c_i(R)c_j(R)\le\frac{a^2}{2(p-2)}\sum_{i=1}^n c_i(R)\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\varphi_R^{a-2}u_i^{\frac{4-p}{2}}|\nabla\varphi|^2dx\le\\ \le\frac{a^2}{2(p-2)}\Big(\max_{1\le i\le n}c_i(R)\Big)\sum_{i=1}^n\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\varphi_R^{a-2}u_i^{\frac{4-p}{2}}|\nabla\varphi|^2\,dx\end{aligned}$$

and hence, by Young's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_2\sum_{i=1}^n\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}u_i^{\frac p2}\varphi_R^a\,dx\le\sum_{i=1}^n\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\varphi_R^{a-2}u_i^{\frac{4-p}{2}}|\nabla\varphi_R|^2\,dx\le\\ \le\frac{\kappa_2}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}u_i^{\frac p2}\varphi_R^{\frac{p(a-2)}{4-p}}\,dx+\sum_{i=1}^n\kappa_3\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}|\nabla\varphi_R|^{\frac{2p}{2p-4}}\,dx.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{p(a-2)}{4-p} = a$ and $\frac{2p}{2p-4}\ge 2$, we finally get

$$\frac{\kappa_2}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}u_i^{\frac p4}\varphi_R^a\,dx\le\kappa_3\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}|\nabla\varphi_R|^2\,dx\to 0\qquad\text{as } R\to+\infty.$$

Thus $\int_{B_R(0)} u_i^{\frac p2}\,dx\to 0$ as $R\to+\infty$ and hence $u_i\equiv 0$ for every i, contrary to what we have assumed. □

By combining Theorems 4.1 and 4.3 we obtain the following result.

Corollary 4.2. *Let $N\le 2$, $2 < p \le 4$ and let $B\in S(n)$, $n\ge 2$, be such that $\beta_{ii}\ge 0$. Then the system* (1.1) *admits a nontrivial solution if and only if B is not strictly copositive.*

Finally, for a general dimension N, we have an easy sufficient condition to check the strict $(p-1)$–copositivity of a matrix, and hence also a general sufficient condition for the nonexistence of solutions of (4.1).

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose that*

$$\beta_{ii} > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad \sum_{\substack{j=1\\ j\neq i}}^{n} \beta_{ij}^- > -\beta_{ii} \qquad \text{for } i=1,\dots,n, \tag{4.6}$$

where $\beta_{ij}^- = \min\{\beta_{ij},0\}$. *Then B is strictly $(p-1)$–copositive for every $p>2$. In particular if* (4.6) *holds and either* $2<p\leq \frac{2N-2}{N-2}$ *with* $N\geq 3$, *or* $2<p<\infty$ *and* $N\leq 2$, *then* (1.1) *does not admit a nontrivial solution by Proposition 4.1.*

Proof. Using the simple inequality $s^{\frac{p}{2}}t^{\frac{p}{2}-1} + s^{\frac{p}{2}-1}t^{\frac{p}{2}} \leq s^{p-1}+t^{p-1}$ for $s,t\geq 0$ and the fact that $B=(\beta_{ij})_{ij}$ is symmetric, we obtain, by arguing exactly as in the proof of Proposition 1.3, that

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{n} \beta_{ij} c_j^{\frac{p}{2}} c_i^{\frac{p}{2}-1} \geq \kappa_0 \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i^{p-1} > 0$$

for every $c\in C_+^n\setminus\{0\}$ and $\kappa_0 := \min_{i=1,\dots,n}\Big(\beta_{ii}+\sum_{j\neq i}\beta_{ij}^-\Big) > 0$. □

5. Appendix

Here we prove that the matrix

$$B_\varepsilon = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1+\varepsilon & -1+\varepsilon \\ -1+\varepsilon & 1 & 1 \\ -1+\varepsilon & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \varepsilon>0.$$

(see (1.12)) is not strictly cubically copositive for $\varepsilon>0$ small. This was claimed in Section 1. Suppose by contradiction that there exists a sequence of positive numbers $\varepsilon_k\to 0$ such that B_{ε_k} is strictly cubically copositive for all k. Then there exists $(\mu_1^k,\mu_2^k,\mu_3^k)\in \mathrm{int}(C_+^3)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_1^k\left(c_1^3+(\varepsilon_k-1)c_1c_2^2+(\varepsilon_k-1)c_1c_3^2\right)+\mu_2^k\left((\varepsilon_k-1)c_1^2c_2+c_2^3+c_2c_3^2\right)+\\ +\mu_3^k\left((\varepsilon_k-1)c_1^2c_3+c_2^2c_3+c_3^3\right)>0\end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

for every $c\in C_+^3\setminus\{0\}$. By dividing the previous inequality by $\mu_1^k>0$, we can suppose without loss of generality that $\mu_1^k=1$. We show that

$$\mu_2^k\to 1, \quad \mu_3^k\to 1 \qquad \text{as } k\to\infty. \tag{5.2}$$

Taking $c=(\lambda,1,0)\in C_+^3$ in (5.1) with $\lambda>0$, we obtain

$$(\lambda^3+(\varepsilon_k-1)\lambda)+\mu_2^k((\varepsilon_k-1)\lambda^2+1)>0 \quad \text{ for every } k\in\mathbb{N}$$

and hence

$$(\lambda^3-\lambda)+\liminf_{k\to\infty}\Big[\mu_2^k(1-\lambda^2)\Big]\geq 0.$$

As a consequence, we get

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \mu_2^k \geq \lambda \quad \text{for all } \lambda \in (0,1) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \limsup_{k\to\infty} \mu_2^k \leq \lambda \quad \text{for all } \lambda > 1,$$

which eventually yields $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mu_2^k = 1$. Considering $c = (\lambda, 0, 1)$ in (5.1), a similar argument shows that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mu_3^k = 1$. By combining (5.1) with (5.2), we conclude that

$$(c_1^3 - c_1c_2^2 - c_1c_3^2) + (-c_1^2c_2 + c_2^3 + c_2c_3^2) + (-c_1^2c_3 + c_2^2c_3 + c_3^3) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } c \in C_+^3,$$

which is false when evaluated at $c = (3, 2, 2)$.

Acknowledgments. H. Tavares was supported by FCT, grant SFRH/BD/28964/2006 and Financiamento Base 2008 - ISFL/1/209.
A large part of the paper was written while H. Tavares was visiting the University of Frankfurt. His stay was also partially supported by a grant of the Justus-Liebig-University, Giessen.

References

[1] A. Ambrosetti and E. Colorado, Bound and ground states of coupled nonlinear Schrodinger equations, *C.R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris* 342 (2006), 453-458.

[2] T. Bartsch, Z.-Q. Wang Note on ground states of nonlinear Schrödinger systems *J. Partial Diff. Eqs,* 19 (2006), 200-207.

[3] S. Chang, C. Lin, T. Lin, W. Lin, Segregated nodal domains of two-dimensional multispecies Bose-Einstein condensates., *Phys. D* 196 (2004), 341-361.

[4] N. Dancer, J.-C. Wei, T. Weth, A priori bounds versus multiple existence of positive solutions for a nonlinear Schrödinger system, *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire* 27 (2010), 953-969.

[5] N. Dancer, T. Weth, in preparation.

[6] P.H. Diananda, On non-negative forms in real variables some or all of which are non-negative. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 58 (1962) 17–25.

[7] B. D. Esry, C. H. Greene, J. P. Burke Jr., J. L. Bohn, Hartree-Fock theory for double condensates, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 78 (1997), 3594-3597.

[8] B. Gidas. Symmetry properties and isolated singularities of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations. In *Nonlinear partial differential equations in engineering and applied science (Proc. Conf., Univ. Rhode Island, Kingston, R.I., 1979)*, volume 54 of *Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math.*, pages 255–273. Dekker, New York, 1980.

[9] B. Gidas, J. Spruck, A priori bounds for positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations, *Comm. Part. Diff. Eq.* 6 (1981), 883–901.

[10] B. Gidas, J. Spruck, Global and local behavior of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 34 (1981), 525–598

[11] D.H.. Jacobson, Extensions of linear-quadratic control, optimization and matrix theory. Mathematics in Science and Engineering, Vol. 133. Academic Press, London-New York, 1977

[12] P. Li, Y. Y. Feng, Criteria for Copositive Matrices of Order Four, *Linear Algebra Appl.* 194 (1993), 109–124

[13] T.-C. Lin, J.-C. Wei Ground states of N coupled nonlinear Schrödinger equations in $\mathbb{R}^n$, $n \leq 3$, *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 255 (2005), 629-653.

[14] T.-C. Lin and J.-C. Wei, Spikes in two coupled nonlinear Schrodinger equations, *Ann. de l'Institut H. Poincaré Analyse Nonlinéare* 22 (2005), 403-439.

[15] L.A. Maia, E. Montefusco and B. Pellacci, Positive solutions for a weakly coupled nonlinear Schrödinger system, *J. Diff. Eqns.* 229 (2006), 743-767.

[16] B. Noris, M. Ramos, Existence and bounds of positive solutions for a nonlinear Schrödinger system, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 138 (2010), 1681-1692.

[17] B. Noris, H. Tavares, S. Terracini, G. Verzini, Uniform Hölder bounds for nonlinear Schrödinger systems with strong competition, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 63 (2010), 267-302.

[18] W. Reichel, H. Zou, Non-existence results for semilinear cooperative elliptic systems via moving spheres, *J. Differential Equations* 161 (2000), 219–243.

[19] B. Sirakov, Least energy solitary waves for a system of nonlinear Schrodinger equations, *Comm. Math. Physics* 271 (2007), 199-221.

[20] W. Walter, Über ganze Lösungen der Differentialgleichung $\Delta u = f(u)$. Jber. Deutsch. Math. Verein. 57 (1955), 94–102.

[21] J.C. Wei, T. Weth, Nonradial symmetric bound states for a system of coupled Schrödinger equations, *Rend. Lincei Mat. Appl.* 18 (2007), 279-293.

[22] J.C. Wei, T. Weth, Radial solutions and phase separation in a system of two coupled Schrödinger equations, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.* 190 (2008), 83–106.

[23] M. Willem. *Minimax theorems.* Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 24. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 1996.

`htavares@ptmat.fc.ul.pt`
University of Lisbon, CMAF, Faculty of Science, Av. Prof. Gama Pinto 2, 1649-003 Lisboa, Portugal
`susanna.terracini@unimib.it`
Dipartimento di Matematica e Applicazioni, Università degli Studi di Milano-Bicocca, via Bicocca degli Arcimboldi 8, 20126 Milano, Italy
`gianmaria.verzini@polimi.it`
Dipartimento di Matematica, Politecnico di Milano, p.za Leonardo da Vinci 32, 20133 Milano, Italy
`weth@math.uni-frankfurt.de`
Institut für Mathematik, Goethe-Universität Frankfurt, Robert-Mayer-Str. 10, D-60054 Frankfurt a.M., Germany